

Response to Office Action
SN 10/772,738
Customer No. 33354

REMARKS

A. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claim 18 has been indicated to be allowable as written. Claims 2 and 6 have been objected to by the Examiner who has noted that these claims would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-17 have been rejected to based on prior art. Claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 11-17 have been amended as described herein and claim 1 has been cancelled.

B. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 18 is allowable as written. The Examiner has objected to claims 2 and 6 as they depend from a rejected base claim. But, the Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if they were re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants have amended claims 2 and 6 to place them in independent form and to include all the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Claim 6 has also been amended to have the same scope as it did when filed. Therefore, claims 2 and 6 are now believed to be allowable and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his objection of these claims and allow them.

Response to Office Action
SN 10/772,738
Customer No. 33354

C. § 103 Rejections Citing Angeley et al. and Kocher et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-10 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious when U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0138119 to Angeley et al. (Angeley) is viewed with U.S. Patent No. 4,176,925 to Kocher et al. (Kocher). A claim is *prima facie* obvious only if the prior art reference (or references when combined) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *MPEP §2143*.

Claim 1 has been cancelled and thus the rejection of claim 1 on these grounds is moot. Claims 3, 7, 8, and 12 have been amended to all depend from claim 2 which is believed to be allowable. Due to these amendments, claims 4, 5 and 9, 10 also now depend from allowable claim 2. Therefore, claims 3-5, 7-10 and 12 all now depend from claim 2 and are believed to be allowable based on their dependency to an allowable base claim and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection of these claims.

D. § 103 Rejections Citing Angeley and Okazaki et al.

The Examiner has rejected claim 11 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious when Angeley is viewed with U.S. Patent No. 6,900,916 to Ozakaki et al. (Ozakaki). Again, a claim is *prima facie* obvious only if the prior art reference (or references when combined) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *MPEP §2143*.

Response to Office Action
SN 10/772,738
Customer No. 33354

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 2 and is now believed to be allowable based on its dependency to an allowable base claim. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of this claim.

E. § 103 Rejections Citing Miller and Okazaki et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13-16 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious when U.S. Patent No. 5,879,376 to Miller is viewed with Okazaki. Again, a claim is *prima facie* obvious only if the prior art reference (or references when combined) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *MPEP §2143*.

Claims 13-16 have all been amended to depend from claim 2 and are now believed to be allowable based on their dependency to an allowable base claim. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of these claims.

D. § 103 Rejections Citing Angeley

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Angeley. Again, a claim is *prima facie* obvious only if the prior art reference (or references when combined) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *MPEP §2143*.


Claim 17 has been amended to include a limitation similar to the one set forth in allowable claim 2. Specifically, claim 17 has been amended to recite a single optical element that deflects light in any directly forward of the single

Response to Office Action
SN 10/772,738
Customer No. 33354

optical element. As the Examiner knows, this feature is neither shown nor suggested in Angeley and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of this claim as well.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and rejections have been traversed, and that the application is in form for issuance. If the Examiner has any suggestions or comments that would place the application in even better form for allowance, he is invited to call Applicants' representative, Damon Ashcraft at 602-681-3331.

Respectfully submitted,

Damon Ashcraft
Registration No. 51,024 &
Sandra L. Etherton
Registration No. 36,982

Etherton Law Group, LLC
Customer No. 33354
5555 E. Van Buren St. Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85008-3422
Tel: 602-681-3331
Fax: 602-681-3339